Human Events THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER

Vol. XVII, No. 17 April 28, 1960 Section 1 — News

GOLDWATER: *GOP's logical Keynoter* (page 1)
JERSEY: *Case's chameleon campaign* .... (page 1)
KENNEDY: *Catholic disenchantment* .... (page 2)
DE GAULLE: *Lodge not his man* ..... (page 2)
MARK CLARK: *Critic of the UN* ..... (page 3)

LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Action from Arizona: Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican from Arizona, took a leap further ahead last week in the HUMAN EVENTS poll of GOP county chairmen, outdistancing both Henry Cabot Lodge and House Leader Halleck. The Senator, outstanding exponent of conservative political action in the Republican party, thereby has qualified himself for assuming a high place in the councils of his party.

Among Republicans on Capitol Hill, Goldwater's looming prominence inspires demands for a spot for him—commensurate with his importance—at the national convention to be held in Chicago on July 25. The call is for Goldwater for Temporary Chairman of the convention, who is also the Keynoter. His oratorical gifts and authentic expression of conservative Republican ideals and policies would give effective shape to the convention's proceedings and a better start to the campaign for party victory in November.

Indeed, the man from Arizona has so invigorated the conservatives that they plan to stake claims for two other top posts in the organization of the convention—for Permanent Chairman to go to Senator Styles Bridges and Chairman of the Platform Committee to go to Senator Karl Mundt.

This set-up of the Convention in advance assumes great importance in the minds of politicos (although it is little understood by amateurs in the party). The pros recall many instances in party history where early planning for the convention has brought forth fruit and neglect has caused disaster. In the Democratic party, it is recalled that a floor fight at the 1912 Baltimore convention for election of Keynoter (Temporary Chairman) so roused Elder Statesman William Jennings Bryan that he threw his weight behind Woodrow Wilson and upset the front runner that year, Speaker Champ Clark. Bryan got Wilson nominated and the Republican split that year permitted Wilson to obtain the Presidency.

In short, the GOP mood on the Hill is that "we'd better make changes now, so as to win later." Specifically, the regulars want the President to change his cabinet so as to jettison liabilities which may cost the party dearly next fall. First on the list, among the farm state members of Congress, is Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson. However good his intentions, he's too much of a liability in the western states—it is said. But of even greater importance, many think, is the necessity of getting rid of Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Flemming. Mitchell's affiliation with the Labor Bosses chills not only the rurals, but also urban elements long in rebellion against labor union monopoly.

Just now, Flemming has managed to enrage Republicans more than the others, because of his stubborn efforts in behalf of some "socialized medicine" measure like the Forand bill—all despite President Eisenhower's vigorous objections. When AFL-CIO leader James B. Carey called Ike's attitude a "shameful surrender" to the American Medical Association (which opposes the Forand bill), Flemming sat silent in the committee room facing Carey and uttered no word in defense of his President. But GOP Senate leader Everett Dirksen shouted that Carey's statement was "stinking," "shameful" and "insane" and glanced at Flemming to back him up. Flemming merely looked embarrassed. Fireworks like this reinforce the desires of regular Republicans that Ike purge his Administration of such "crypto-Democrats" as Mitchell and Flemming.

Korea: Veterans on Capitol Hill interpret the Korean riots as Communist-inspired, designed by Moscow to soften American opinion, in preparation for armed intervention by Red puppet North Korea "to restore democracy." President Syngman Rhee, stout battler against Communists, had won the recent elections. Losers, swollen by Communists, rioted, yelling for "democracy." Significantly, they attacked an anti-Communist propaganda center. The Washington *Evening Star*, commenting editorially on Secretary Herter's note of reprimand to Rhee, said it had an "out-of-this-world" quality.

New Jersey: While the "liberal" press trumpets the triumph of Senator Clifford Case in his renomination fight with Robert Morris as proof positive that GOP conservatives are "out of joint with the times," in the words of Harry Truman, thoughtful students of politics who have studied Case's voting record closely have another tale to tell—a tale which indicates that Case carefully blurred his "liberal" image in the last year to appeal to conservative voters.

A variety of "liberal" and conservative organizations annually issue "score sheets" rating members of Congress as left-wing or right-wing. These ratings over the last three years reveal a startling shift in Case's voting posture: in 1957 and 1958, before the shadow of Morris loomed on the horizon, Case voted conservative only 15 to 25 per cent of the time; in 1959, knowing he faced a fight from the conservative Morris, Case scored 50 to 60 per cent conservative.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS • In Four Sections

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By this dramatic switch, Case was able to tell New Jersey voters that the issue was not conservative vs. "liberal," that he was a "moderate"—and he was abetted in this deception by the "liberal" press of the East Coast, which staged a last-minute blitzkrieg over Easter weekend painting Morris as the candidate of "rich boobs" and reactionaries, and Case as "moderate" and "sound." Morris had no time to reply to these attacks.

Additional factors complicate the picture and undermine the contentions of the "liberals" who are now telling Vice President Nixon that the New Jersey results show he must "move left" to win, even though Case had to "move right." For one, New Jersey is not a typical state; its East Coast position makes it more internationalist than most of the country, and it has no hinterland (such as upstate New York) to modify the "liberalism" it is constantly fed from the New York City press. A "moderate" position, such as that taken by Case in 1959, will satisfy enough of the party regulars, particularly when the "moderate" is an incumbent and his opponent is not widely known among the state's political leaders.

Case also ran as an "Ike man," though on at least 19 test issues last year he went to the left of the President. He was aided in riding Ike's coattails by two members of the President's Cabinet, who broke the White House "hands-off" policy in primary fights by coming out for Case.

Labor Secretary Mitchell, yielding to labor boss pressure, announced he had cast an absentee ballot for Case, and Secretary of State Herter contributed funds to Case—who worked both sides of the street by charging Morris was running a "well-financed campaign," largely with out-of-state money, while the published figures showed that Case actually outspent Morris by $47,000 to $29,000.

Kennedy: With Jack Kennedy slugging it out in West Virginia over the question of his Catholicism in an attempt to gain support in that overwhelmingly Protestant state, indications appear that he may be talking himself into trouble with Catholic voters.

Now prominent in the thinking of many Catholics, both laymen and clergy, is the feeling that Kennedy is bending well to the left to appease and gain the support of the ADA-"liberal" wing of the Democratic party—a group not noted for its pilgrimages to Vatican City.

This theory gained support last week with Kennedy's championing of the leftish National Council of Churches. Jack scored the Air Force manual which published information on Communist front affiliations of Protestant clergymen. He called the documented material "shocking and distasteful," adding an opinion that the NCC is "as strongly opposed to communism as any church group in the country."

Anti-Communists of all faiths are wondering whether Kennedy considers the Council's action in 1958, when 600 of its members met for a "World Order Study Conference" and voted in favor of recognizing Red China, as typical of that organization's "strong opposition to communism."

Catholic sources also recall an article Kennedy wrote for *Look* magazine February 16, 1959. Although no campaign pressure was on the Senator at the time to take such a position, he called for complete separation of church and state and stated he firmly opposes sending an Ambassador to the Vatican.

Now, it is noted, little more than a year after his "church and state" pronouncement (which was interpreted as meaning that if elected to the Presidency he would stay clear of the influence of his own church), Kennedy has called upon the Red-front-spotted NCC to express its views "on the major social and economic issues confronting our Nation."

Aside from private dissatisfaction with the Massachusetts man, Governor David Lawrence (himself a Catholic) of Pennsylvania reportedly is intensifying his opposition to the Kennedy candidacy. Lawrence has said that Jack is far from ready for the Nation's highest office, and that his defeat could cause lasting party wounds.

Reported the New York *Herald Tribune* last week: "Intimates of Governor Lawrence believe that he is somewhat concerned that [Kennedy] may be placing his own future higher than the party's . . . . He told the Kennedy camp that he believes a Catholic can be elected President—but that if the party is going to risk nominating one, he must be right in all other respects."

● Capitol Hill's attention has been drawn to the growing number of Catholic priests across the country who stress to parishioners that to vote for a Catholic candidate because of his religion and not because they consider him the better man is a sin. Father John Kelly, head of information for the National Catholic Welfare Conference, told HUMAN EVENTS: "There are 50,000 Catholic clergymen in our country, and this fact has been stressed to the people by thousands of them."

De Gaulle and Lodge: Last week Diplomatic Row buzzed with talk about how the French President snubbed UN Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. Diplomats, who expressed surprise that so many Americans think "Lodge has done a good job" in his post, now wonder if the "truth about Lodge as a US international figure" isn't beginning to leak out.

The facts, as relayed by the embassies and partly confirmed by the press, are that Lodge wanted to be De Gaulle's "escort" during the General's trip to the US as part of his build-up to win the Vice-Presidential spot, or, failing that, to claim the post of Secretary of State if Nixon wins the Presidency. The President turned down the Lodge bid, and chose Undersecretary of State Dillon as "escort" to De Gaulle instead.

The President rejected Lodge—according to Embassy Row—because the French President said an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emphatic "no" to the State Department on Lodge. Reason: The French claim that Lodge double-crossed them in the fracas about the UN proposal to investigate Algeria (perhaps the touchiest question of all to the French). Initially, Lodge assured the French UN Ambassador that the US would vote "no" to the UN Communist-backed proposal to mix into the Algerian affair. The French had been counting on that negative vote. When the poll was taken, Lodge ducked out—he did not vote at all. Small matter to many Americans—but a big slap in the face to the French. Hence, when French diplomats were consulted by the State Department about naming Lodge as "escort" for De Gaulle, the answer was "no." However, Dillon would be "acceptable." (Dillon formerly served as US Ambassador to France, and also aspires to succeed Christian Herter as Secretary of State.)

The Washington *Evening Star* commented (April 17) that "Mr. Dillon may be putting a crimp into the political ambitions of Henry Cabot Lodge." On Capitol Hill, legislators are pleased, for they realize the importance of cultivating the good will of General De Gaulle. And not a few—better aware than people in the country that Lodge has *not* done a good job in the UN—gladly go along with "putting a crimp into the political ambitions of Henry Cabot Lodge."

Castro: One of the latest of Castro's shenanigans has not been aired in the press and only a few on Capitol Hill are aware of it. Some in the business world, however, have acquired rather extensive knowledge of it and they wonder what Congress will do when the Nation's legislative body realizes what Castro is planning to do with a certain piece of US Government property on Cuban soil, which cost the taxpayers of the US some $175 million when it was built during World War II. They refer to the famous Nicaro nickel mine in Oriente province of Cuba, which is under the General Services Administration of the US Government.

The story goes that Castro and Mikoyan, the Russian Commissar who recently visited Cuba, hatched a scheme of which the main object is to provide Soviet Russia with cheap Cuban nickel from the US Government mine.

Some outlines of the scheme were recently released through the Polish Communist diplomatic corps. This is it: Nicaro (Cuban) nickel would be sold to Soviet Russia. Russia would pay for the mineral through Egypt by shipping Russian-made tractors to Nasser. Egypt in turn would send Egyptian cotton to Cuba, where American-owned textile mills (seized by the Castro Government) would process the cotton. When Castro gives the order to sell Nicaro's nickel to Russia, what will GSA do?

Capitol Camera: The Democratic grapevine reports that Lyndon Johnson's Presidential stock is rising because Southern Senators are telling Dixie that the Texan gave them the fairest shake possible on the civil rights bill.

● Former GOP House leader Joe Martin's memoirs are set for August publication, and Washington wonders if the retelling of last year's bloody leadership battle with Charlie Halleck will open old wounds as elections near.

● Representative H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa) last week cut $65 million in construction money for three D.C. Federal buildings. Said Gross: "I'm tired of voting so much money for the District of Columbia when I can't even get a new privy for the post office back home."

● Pennsylvania attorney Andrew Green has begun a write-in campaign for Barry Goldwater in that state's April 26 Presidential primary.

● The principal and all 32 teachers in a 600-pupil Georgia high school resigned last week because the county school board wouldn't back up a teacher who paddled a troublesome youngster.

● Milton Eisenhower is ill, suffering from a "common complaint" as a result of his recent South American tour.

● The Daughters of the American Revolution last week in Washington presented General Albert C. Wedemeyer with their annual certificate of merit. The General is the author of the important nonfiction bestseller *Wedemeyer Reports!* ($6.00), which sold over 100,000 copies after an abridgement of the book appeared as a HUMAN EVENTS article.

● Rumor—Walter Reuther and George Meany have gone to visit Harry Truman to determine if the former President would take the Democratic Presidential nomination.

● Controversial Paul Butler, Democratic Party Chairman, has begun organizing the convention set-up with Chester Bowles (a Kennedy supporter) as head of the Platform Committee. Southerners threaten bolt if Butler fills other posts with other "liberals."

Mark Clark on the UN: A call by General Mark Clark for the US to pull out of the UN is receiving some attention on Capitol Hill. Clark, who commanded the "UN" troops in Korea, said, "Nothing good will happen in the UN. I've seen them meet time after time on very grave questions that affect the well-being of the whole world and never have they solved any of them."

THE ACA-INDEX

A Stark Appraisal of the Voting Record of Each United States Senator (1955-1959) and Representative (1957-1959). Now, for the first time, you can have at your finger tips an easily-understood *evaluation* of those who represent you in Congress.

HUMAN EVENTS 408 First St., S. E., Wash. 3, D. C.

Please send me the ACA-INDEX, at the pre-publication price of $12.50 (after May 19: $15).

☐ Payment Enclosed ☐ Bill Me.

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As more new nations are admitted to the UN, the US's position is endangered, Clark said, since the new countries of Asia and Africa tend to side with the Soviet Union on many issues. "I foresee in the future a time when the balance of power will be against the US," Clark told a radio audience last week, echoing the words of Dr. Edna Fluegel in last week's HUMAN EVENTS article, "The United Nations."

Clark's forceful presentation so alarmed one-worlders in the Nation's Capital that the Washington *Post* quickly charged Clark with being "juvenile" and wanting to secede from the world community—thus confusing the 40-story tombstone in New York with the planet Earth, as one Washingtonian put it. But Clark's case had more substance to it than the "liberals" were willing to admit, say students of African affairs here: eight African states are scheduled to receive independence in the next year. Six of them—which will have one vote apiece in the UN—have a total of 20 million citizens, but these 20 million people could outvote the US's 180 million by six to one in the UN.

USIA: America's propaganda arm, the United States Information Agency, has put out a film on Soviet Premier Khrushchev's visit to the US which is condemned by some Americans who have seen the film as "a fraud and a propaganda victory for the Soviets."

Shown to selected Russian and European audiences by American embassies, the Hearst Metrotone 30-minute colored reel is supposedly designed as counter-propaganda to a Soviet film on Khrushchev's visit.

A HUMAN EVENTS *reporter, however, who saw both the Russian and the American films in a special showing by USIA officials said the American product is "a ballyhoo for Khrushchev. The film leaves the firm impact on the audience that the 'Butcher of Budapest' is a sincere man of peace, who has received a hero's welcome in the US."*

Although "Khrushchev's American Journey" purports to be a "true and visual record" of the dictator's tour of the US, combined reports from various viewers who have seen the film show it to be nothing of the kind.

According to all these reports the attempt has been deliberately made in the American film to show that Khrushchev was warmly greeted by all Americans. A USIA official claimed this was to offset Soviet propaganda which has explained the lack of enthusiasm by Americans for Khrushchev as a result of American police who kept the crowds away. To "offset" the propaganda, the USIA film seeks to prove the blatant falsehood that the mass of Americans endorse the man that many Russians call the "hangman of the Ukraine." Not only are anti-K incidents eliminated, but the film pauses long enough for a special 21-gun salute to Khrushchev. All through the film the narrator talks of large and enthusiastic crowds waiting to see the Soviet dictator. In Pittsburgh the narrator claims that never in the city's history has there been such enthusiasm. Viewers say this goes one better than the Russian film which actually showed a Pittsburgh newspaper headline, "City Cool to Mr. K."

Although the USIA claims it used K's tour as a means of showing the Russian and European viewers the farms and houses of America, it shows very little more than the Russian film. And the elimination of the shots of the steel strike, which the Russian film shows, only leaves the impression the US has doctored its version.

In view of such USIA propaganda, some Senators are now in a mood to prune the $117 million appropriation bill voted for the USIA by the House.

Labor Front: The Supreme Court in its last week's decision affecting the Chicago & Northwestern Railway threw up a roadblock in the way of business efforts to end featherbedding. The Court ruled that the Railroad Telegraphers Union may legally strike the Northwestern to obtain a job security clause in their collective bargaining agreement.

The railroad has set up a plan to close down as superfluous a number of one-man stations in midwestern states where the road operates and state commissions approved. The union sought to force the company to agree that no position could be abolished except by mutual agreement, and the company refused. Strike threatened and the courts were invoked. The Supreme Court, in its decision, said: "It may be, as some people think, that Congress was unwise in curtailing the jurisdiction of Federal courts in railroad disputes as it did in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Arguments have even been presented here pointing to the financial debilitation of the . . . railroad and to the absolute necessity for the abandonment of railroad stations. These arguments, however, are addressed to the wrong forum. If the scope of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is to be cut down in order to prevent 'waste' by the railroads, Congress should be the body to do so."

In short, the High Court—so often accused of "legislating" in favor of "liberal" policies—has thus declined to do so, when faced with the issue of featherbedding.

However, experts on labor law on Capitol Hill do agree that the Court has thrown the ball to Congress and its decision points up the necessity of conservatives in Senate and House to drastically re-write the basic labor law to correct abuses (such as featherbedding) and others which were left untouched by the Landrum-Griffin Act passed last summer. This—experts agree—would constitute a big order, but the responsibility lies with Congress, and no help may be expected from the Supreme Court, as presently constituted.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.
For change of address send old address **EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS** on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.
Bound volumes indexed, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors
JOHN R. BENEDICT NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 17 — Section II

HUMAN EVENTS

April 28, 1960

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

President From Dixie?

The South Holds the Cards for a Spectacular Upset

By JOHN J. SYNON
Assistant Director, Americans for Constitutional Action

A NEARLY UNBELIEVABLE political bonanza lies at the feet of Southern leaders. Once its significance is realized, they will have within their grasp the power to realign the political axis of the Nation. They will, that is, if they move with determination, unity and cohesion. And if they falter, their traditional pattern of life and American constitutional government as a whole may well be lost beyond recall.

For the stage has been set to permit the election, *this* year, of a Southerner as President of the United States.

Oddly enough, this rather breath-taking development has come about with no concerted effort by the South, with little fanfare and with hardly a soul realizing its cumulative potential. Like a Southern development of a century ago, this one "just growed."

Yet, to a practiced eye, this child of the field appears sturdy. For it is no longer, as it was two years ago when HUMAN EVENTS was the first to report this possibility ("A Southern President?" by John J. Synon, August 11, 1958), contingent upon "ifs" and "whereases." It is there now; hard, concrete, easily spelled out. Whatever incredible elements surround it are born of its sheer magnitude. But incredible or not, there it is—the Presidency.

The fact is this: Since the last Presidential election, six Southern states, one by one, have "freed" their Electoral-College delegates from all moral obligation to vote for any predetermined party nominee. This is an accomplished fact. As a consequence, these states—barring a sweep by either a Republican or "liberal" Democrat—may very well hold the balance of power when the Electoral College meets "on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December" (as the Constitution states).

That being so, the electors from these six states, 57 in number, by voting for a third person could destroy the possibility of either major-party nominee obtaining enough votes to win. Thus they would force the election into the House of Representatives. And there, again, the South would hold the balance of power.

From this situation could come the first genuinely-Southern President since Andrew Johnson succeeded the assassinated Lincoln, in 1865.

In total, there are 537 electoral votes, 269 being the majority number needed to elect. And while both major parties are trumpeting of a victory in the offing, trumpeting doesn't count in the balloting.

In the tally sheets their bookmakers present, the South plays a dominant role — on either side. The Democrats claim everything south of the Mason-Dixon. The Republicans base their hope on Nixon's taking five, maybe six Southern states: Florida, Louisiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia, the same states Eisenhower carried in 1956. (Nixon's inner circle privately counts only Florida, Texas, North Carolina and Tennessee.)

Manifestly, somebody's book is wrong. It could be both are wrong. For the South, believing as it does that it is unfairly put upon by the Liberal-Labor wing of its hybrid party, has long since left the national Democratic fold. The South hasn't been "solid" since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Which does not mean — as the Republicans wishfully hope it means — the South is becoming Republican. There is little that is Republican in the South except an appointee or two, gobbling political goodies against the hour glass of that inevitable first Monday after a certain second Wednesday.

Rather, the South has been voting "Eisenhower" to show its repugnance for the nominees its Liberal-Labor wing has foisted upon it and for no other reason. To argue otherwise is to show an utter lack of understanding for things political in Dixie. How many Republican Congressmen or Senators or Governers are elected down South?

SO, WITH THE WHIP of "civil rights" beating around their shoulders, these six Southern states with their 57 electoral votes, Louisiana (10), Alabama (11), Mississippi (8), Arkansas (8), Georgia (12) and South Carolina (8), have fixed it so they won't have to vote Republican again—ever. They don't know exactly what they plan to do with their new freedom—there is no "master" plan—but the germ of an idea is forming in their near-desperate heads. They are beginning to look about them. They should realize their political potential, their bonanza, before long.

Southerners remember 1948—the wise ones do—and how close they came that year to achieving

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their century-old dream. And they remember the mistakes they made in their blind anger to get away from The Old Harry.

They do remember 1948 and how, with but a switch of 12,487 popular votes, 3,554 of them in Ohio, and 8,933 in California, these two states would have gone Republican and Truman's 303 Electoral-College votes would have shrunk to 253, less than the needed majority (266 in 1948). And they know, given Ohio and California, Dewey still would not have made it. For The Little Man on the Wedding Cake polled but 189 electoral votes, in his own right, and the 50 votes he nearly won still would have left him short of the needed majority. In other words, neither Truman nor Dewey would have had the necessary votes to win—*had* Dewey taken California and Ohio.

How can that be? Easy. Strom Thurmond, the States Rights candidate, polled 39 Electoral-College votes. Remember?

So, as politically green as the South was on national elections, in 1948, it came within a hair's breadth of having the House of Representatives decide whom the President would be.

And this, a person need not recall, was long before Earl Warren's Court whipped the South into a froth, before race-riot blood was running in the streets of Chattanooga and Montgomery.

Dixie, this time out, will not repeat its third-party mistake of 1948. Southern politicians know their people, they know they are emotionally locked—Republicans please note—to the party of their fathers. Southerners are Democrats only next to being Southerners. There won't be any third party in 1960, just a loose affiliation, an "understanding."

Instead, the South will continue to vote within the confines of the party. Then in turn, its electors —"freed" as they are—will vote for whomever they choose, just like the Constitution says they should, just like the Founding Fathers intended they should.

Then let their radical, shrimp-whistling brethren vent their spleen, let 'em scream—the election will be in the House, God in His Heaven and all will be right with the world.

TO PROPERLY EVALUATE the significance this possibility holds, a person should check the law, specifically, the Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution, which governs the election of the President.

In the event the Electoral College cannot cast a majority vote for any person, so the Constitution reads, "the House of Representatives shall choose immediately" the President. This shall be done by each state's casting one vote, 26 being the majority.

Even a cursory checking of the congressional delegations will show neither party can muster 26 state blocs in the House. Cannot, that is, if you take from the Democrats their ten "Solid South" votes. Nor will either be able to cast a majority after the November election. For the freshmen, Northern-Democratic Congressmen have been told by their own savants that half of them will be returned to private life, once election day, 1960, comes and goes. And the Republicans, ragtaggle politicians that they are, couldn't capture a majority of the House delegations if you gave them a butterfly net.

Even now, at the flood tide of Northern-Democratic strength, the "liberals" can muster but 22 delegation majorities and these majorities include such "northern" states as Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma, and, glory be, Texas. They also include the "freak" Democratic delegation (of one) from Vermont, as well as the one from Hawaii.

In other words, given the best of it, without the South the Democrats are—as are the Republicans—a minority party.

In short, the Republicans, as a result of this November's election, may be expected to increase the number of congressional delegations they control, but not by enough to elect (26). And the Liberal-Labor Democrats will lose proportionately in strength. Only the ten Southern states may be expected to remain status quo, solidly Southern. They can count on their own ten House votes any time the chips go down.

For it will make no difference if North Carolina—let us say—should so forget itself in casting traditional Democratic ballots as to give its Electoral-College vote to Humphrey or Kennedy. Once the issue is thrown into the House, that state's congressional delegation—as every other state's delegation—will be free to vote for whichever candidate it chooses. And Humphrey or Kennedy as personalities, and stripped of the "Democratic" cloak of anonymity, will hold little charm for North Carolinians. So, the South's vote, in the House, will remain solid.

While the Constitution is silent on how each state shall determine its House "vote"—singular, be it noted——there are precedents.

Two of them: In 1800, when the black-hearted Aaron Burr tried to steal the Presidency from Jefferson, and again in 1824, when the irascible John Q. Adams gave Andrew Jackson the licking of his life. Both times the House was called upon to name the President of the United States.

Majority rule is what counts. If the majority of a state's Congressmen vote for a given candidate, that candidate gets that state's vote. So, while

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is leeway for scalawags to jump the fence, party-to-party within their delegation, it is probable that party discipline will rule and those states which have a majority of Congressmen of Republican persuasion may be expected to vote for the Republican candidate. And those Northern states with a Democratic majority may be expected to support the Liberal-Labor candidate. And—it is pointless to add—Southerners will support their own man.

And these are the only candidates the House can consider, these three. For, the Constitution also says, if the Electoral College proves unable to fulfill its mission, "the persons having the highest number, not exceeding three, on the list of those voted for" by the college, shall be considered by the House. Translated, this means the House must choose from one of these three people: the Republican nominee (Nixon), the "liberal" Democrat (whomever he turns out to be, pull one to your liking from the hat full) and the Southerner.

WITH NO FACTION having majority control the question obviously must be resolved by coalition. Which two of the three factions will combine to elect a President? The reasonable answer, it seems, would be the two most nearly compatible, ideologically. And which two are these?

As a handicapper, a person would be well advised to rule out a marriage of the Republicans (Nixon-Goldwater) and the Northern Democrats (Reuther-Kennedy). And if the Southerners had any idea of rejoining the Northern "liberals," they hardly would have come this circuitous route.

So, the inevitable alignment would be that of the Republicans and the Southern Democrats, thus formalizing a years-old partnership. For time and time again, since 1937, this coalition has worked together, checkmating the more wild-eyed forays of the Liberal-Labor element. This would be an entirely natural alliance.

Given this, whose man would receive the laurel, the Republican candidate for President or that of the Southern Democrats?

For the answer, look again to the Constitution. Look this time at what it says regarding the Vice Presidency. It says, when the Presidency is to be resolved by the House, the Vice President shall be chosen by the Senate, voting *as individuals*, 51 votes being the needed majority. The Senate's choice, however, is restricted to the top two candidates (not the top three, as in the case of the House) in Electoral-College vote for Vice President.

Now, since it is reasonable to assume the Southern bloc will have less Electoral-College strength than either of the two major parties, it is reasonable to conclude its man, the South's Vice-Presidential candidate, under this provision of the Constitution, will be precluded from consideration.

Nevertheless, the South will field a Vice-Presidential candidate if for no other reason than to keep the majority Electoral-College vote from either of the others.

Therefore, since the South cannot, in fact, have its Vice-Presidential candidate named Vice President, it must get the Number One spot or take nothing. And the South, having come thus far, will hardly agree to that sort of hanky panky. It has been too long in the shadows for that.

And how will the Republican politicians sell their constituents on having elected a Southern Democrat as President of the United States?

That depends on the man elected.

THERE IS ONLY ONE, maybe two Southerners who would be acceptable. The more acceptable of these is Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia. If Republican Congressmen were instrumental in electing him President, many, perhaps the majority, of their constituents would dance in the streets.

Republicans, as a group, love and respect Byrd. Over the years he has become a giant in their eyes for, oddly enough, this party-regular Democrat is pretty close to the embodiment of everything thoughtful, conservative Republicans believe in. He has outgrown the public concept of a "party politician."

Moreover, he has nothing to fear, nothing to lose if the effort should prove abortive. Harry Byrd, it will be remembered, wanted to withdraw from the Senate a year or so ago. He wanted to retire, to go back to his apple knocking, to the cool hills of his beloved Blue Ridge. But the people wouldn't have it. Virginians as others flooded him with mail to reconsider his decision. He is in the Senate at the insistence of others—not through personal desire.

So, if Harry Byrd permits his name to be used, he can do so with impunity for he has nothing to fear. Harry Byrd couldn't care less what the Liberal-Labor branch of the Democratic party thinks of him and reprisal threats would serve only to set his mind.

Above all, there is this to be remembered: Harry Flood Byrd was raised in the traditions that motivated Robert E. Lee. If the South calls, Byrd will answer.

Suffice to say, Senator Byrd, as the Southern offering, would be eminently satisfactory to the great majority of our people, Republicans and Democrats alike.

And who would become Vice President?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Politicians, you should know, work on *quid-pro-quo*. Having agreed to the Southern candidate as President, Republicans understandably would demand their man be elected Vice President.

Just who this may be, at this writing, is speculative. This much can be said: Under these circumstances, of necessity, it would be the Republican nominee for Vice President. As to the personality, it might be any of a number of people, of course. But since we are making an optimum winter book, name Barry Goldwater (or Styles Bridges) as Nixon's running mate.

That Goldwater comes from the state (Arizona) adjoining that of Nixon (California) is of no moment. We have Nixon's own words as authority for this. He has said geographical balance, in today's political climate, is passe.

And lest a person think it queer to have a Southern Democrat coupled to a Republican, it should be recalled that this, too, has happened before. Lincoln, patron saint of the Republican party, had a Tennessee Democrat as his Vice President, Andrew Johnson.

THE EFFECT of such a development—the election of a Southerner as President of the United States—would be revolutionary. A person can lose himself in the welter of benefits flowing from such a reorganization of our government. Not the least of these would be the creation of two new parties (Democrat-Republican and Liberal-Labor) with a resultant, long-overdue, realistic realignment of political structure.

But it should be remembered—before the South's cup of enthusiasm runneth over—if the effort is made and fails, the plight of conservatives will be most unhappy. Still, since conservatism is in dire peril as things presently are, the questionable risk involved is justified. Nevertheless, the consequences should be borne in mind.

Whatever the cost, the South means business. For a proper understanding of its feelings about this November's election, a person should harken to the only other Southerner of sufficient stature to lead his people and the country, Dick Russell, senior Senator from Georgia.

In a recent speech before the Georgia Legislature, Russell said: "Our own party has virtually deserted us. The proud democracy of Jefferson and Jackson has become the captive of a left-wing element that is barely Democratic even in name, but which is trying to recast the party in its image.

"Many of this gang of phony liberals and party wreckers have publicly advocated driving the South from the house of our fathers. . . . Those who kick the South in the teeth at every opportunity must not expect us to keep turning the other cheek forever."

Dick Russell said more, much more, but this gives a clear indication of the feelings reflected in the South.

Angry? Certainly Southerners are angry, deep-down angry and they need but a word from Byrd or Russell, the barest consent to use their names, for the South to rally behind them. If either of these men does so, a Byrd or Russell ticket—in the South—will swamp whatever the Liberal-Labor Democrats or the Republicans offer in opposition.

If anyone doubts this to be the South's political tenor, this Sixth Year of the Warren-Court Decision, let him ask a Southerner, any Southerner.

These put-upon people have had it and if they can choose electors of sufficient stature to avoid the man trap of bribery—if they "put only Americans on guard"—nothing can stop them.

For this November, the South will in fact hold the balance of power. What is more, today it holds the only promise this Nation has for rescue from the insidious creep of socialism, now smothering our personal liberties, degrading our people.

If a person remembered the arts of his childhood, he might be forgiven a Rebel yell for Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia, next President of the United States.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "PRESIDENT FROM DIXIE?"

at $_____

☐ *Payment enclosed* ☐ *Bill me*

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 17 — Section III HUMAN EVENTS April 28, 1960

Presidential Hopeful Symington

The Democrats Will Take Him -- If They Have To

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By Willard Edwards
Capitol Hill correspondent for the Chicago Tribune

IT IS SAFE to assume that millions of Americans would be mildly astonished to see upon their television screens next July the beaming countenance of Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri and to hear him acclaimed, against a background of roars at the Los Angeles convention, as the Democratic nominee and "next President of the United States!"

The virtues of "Stu" Symington as a potential Chief Executive have been hidden from the average citizen's eye. He's a handsome, wealthy and amiable gentleman vaguely remembered by many TV viewers for some rather inept and impulsive performances during the McCarthy hearings of 1954.

But, to a growing number of practical politicians, his qualifications as the Democratic standard bearer are becoming steadily more appealing. He is the second choice of a surprising number of Democratic leaders, presently committed to other candidates.

The Wisconsin primary results enhanced Symington's prospects with these shrewd professionals. The West Virginia primary could give him another boost if it also emphasizes the weaknesses of Senator John F. Kennedy in rural Protestant areas.

The Floradora ballad, "Tell Me, Pretty Maiden," has been suggested as Symington's convention theme song. To fretful delegates, deadlocked after a series of non-decisive ballots, the time might come when Symington could evoke an eager response by cooing, invitingly, the climactic lines:

"You really must love someone, and it might as well be me!"

Love, however, will not be the emotion swaying the majority if Symington makes it. Rather, it will by a prudent and calculating decision not to take chances with a Catholic like Kennedy, a Southerner like Johnson, a two-time loser like Stevenson, or an uncontrollable "liberal" like Hubert Humphrey.

Symington has none of these handicaps. He would be a man nobody could hate, pitted against a Republican candidate, Nixon, who has demonstrated an ability to stir emotions ranging from irritation among Republican conservatives to utter loathing among dedicated leftists.

To his negative qualifications, Symington adds some positive attributes which can be built up, under clever management, into an imposing public image.

He is photogenic. His bland and regular features defy caricature. To those vague individuals who say there's something they just don't like about Nixon's looks, Symington will "look like a President."

He will be touted as a practical businessman, an experienced government administrator. He has the whole-hearted endorsement of the AFL-CIO and Americans for Democratic Action. Both find his voting record irreproachable.

Symington is no longer the awkward speaker of some years ago, with a low boiling point and a tendency to blurt out statements which could be fatal in a rough and tumble campaign. He shows the results of careful coaching and an intensive speechmaking campaign in the last 12 months which has taken him from New York to California.

He is able to parry the embarrassing question at press conferences, keep his temper under trying circumstances, duck issues under a flow of words. He has developed a smooth and vigorous delivery which will surprise those who haven't recently seen him in action.

Finally, Symington has proclaimed himself an expert on national defense and agriculture, the two issues regarded by Democrats as embracing major weaknesses in the Republican record. His demands for increased weapons spending of $3 billion annually have earned him substantial backing in the business world from defense contractors interested in additional profits. His farm plan (cost unstated) for price supports far above present levels has a calculated appeal to agricultural areas.

IN THE FACE of this rather impressive summary of Symington's vote-getting potentialities, why do many Republicans, including Nixon, privately hope that he will carry the Democratic banner? The answer lies in an examination of the Missourian's business and government record and his public statements. He is an open target for devastating analysis as a candidate for the most powerful post in the world.

By carefully avoiding primaries, Symington has prevented the pitiless probing of his career by Democratic rivals. Here, briefly, are some of his claims, thus far protected against attack, which would be subject to deflation in a contest:

The Claim: Symington is a practical businessman who proved his ability by making a fortune in the tough world of commerce.

The Fact: Symington's wealth is based upon a million dollar profit he made during World War II as president of the Emerson Electric Manufacturing Co. of St. Louis.

The company hadn't paid a dividend for 10 years when he took it over in 1938 at the invitation of a long-time friend and golfing companion, James Forrestal, who moved to Washington in 1940, eventually winding up as Secretary of Defense.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Symington made other influential friends, John W. Snyder, later Secretary of the Treasury, and Harry Truman, then a Senator from Missouri and chairman of a special Senate committee investigating the defense program.

War contracts began flowing to the Emerson company and it was expanded with government funds. In 1941, according to Securities and Exchange Commission files, the company (of which Symington was president, board chairman and general manager) rewarded him for "extraordinary and unusual services" by giving him an option to purchase 50,000 shares of stock at $4 a share. The stock was worth more than $20 a share when Symington exercised his option in 1943 and 1944.

His $200,000 investment was worth $1,220,046 when he quit the company in July, 1945, to enter government service. The SEC files at the time showed his sale, for a profit of $574,126, of 28,000 shares but did not reveal disposal of the 10,000 shares he retained in his wife's name and 12,000 shares in his own name. The profits, of course, were subject to a capital gains tax instead of the much higher income tax.

The Claim: Symington is an experienced government administrator who has performed with great efficiency in high Federal posts.

The Fact: President Truman, now pushing Symington for the Presidency, showed a damning lack of faith in his protege's administrative ability after having had four years to observe him in office.

Symington was chairman of the National Security Resources Board in 1950 when the Korean war broke out. Congress had created this agency to be the highest policy-making board for allocation of all national resources against emergencies or war. When war did come, Symington had every right to expect that he would be assigned to perform the duties of the office to which he had been appointed.

Instead, the Office of Defense Mobilization was set up and Charles E. Wilson appointed to head it. This was a brutal snub for Symington but it caused no surprise in Washington at the time. Symington didn't fit anyone's idea of a mobilization czar.

The Claim: Symington is the Nation's foremost authority on national defense who has been battling for many years to build up an air and missile defense against Russia.

The Fact: When Symington stepped down in 1950 after four years as civilian head of the Air Force, that branch of the Nation's defense was in such bad shape that fighter planes had to be borrowed from Canada, to replace obsolete, piston-driven craft, when the Korean war broke out less than two months later.

It is true that Symington had fought with Truman over expanding the Air Force but he supported the Truman Budget "without reservation" when it called for a considerably smaller strength. He did not then, as he does now, accuse the Administration of putting a balanced Budget above national security.

As Air Force Secretary, Symington sounded much like Eisenhower today. He declaimed that too much spending could crush this country as easily as a military defeat and that an unchecked armament program could end in "national bankruptcy."

He allowed total spending of $1 billion on missiles during his four-year tenure. Dr. Wernher von Braun has called those years "irretrievably lost." Senator Lister Hill (D.-Ala.) charged that Air Force research development was "repeatedly curtailed by higher authority in the Pentagon" while Symington was Air Force Secretary.

SYMINGTON is now raging about a 4-1 "missile gap" relative to Russia. He places the total blame upon a Republican Administration which spent more money on missiles in its first year than Symington permitted in four years. Thirty billions have been spent since 1953 but the Senator brushes this off as he cries out on the Senate floor against deception of the American people.

There are other yawning cracks in the Senator's political armor which enemy marksmen will easily discover. Observers who know him best just can't see him as Presidential timber. These include his home town newspaper, the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, which is ideologically attuned to Symington's voting record, but which regards his defense speeches with misgivings. Many Americans, the newspaper recently editorialized, are "uneasy about the Senator as a Presidential aspirant."

None can challenge Symington's development of one political technique to perfection. This is known as the "candidacy by denial" method. In 1951, he startled the press by indignantly denouncing rumors, which no one else had heard, that he was interested in the White House. As a freshman Senator in 1953, he repeated these protests. They were uttered, with increasing power, at regular intervals until 1955 when his fellow Missourians, at least, caught on and made him the state's favorite son candidate in 1956.

The denials then were replaced by modest statements that no man could refuse the high honor if it should be thrust upon him. On March 26, 1960, Symington told all. He had succumbed to almost intolerable pressure and was prepared to make the sacrifice.

"He discovered a sure-fire formula," remarked an envious colleague. "It took him nine years but by the sheer vigor of his protests, he denied himself from obscurity right into the running."

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "PRESIDENTIAL HOPEFUL SYMINGTON" at $ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies, $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED